DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 309 801 JC 890 369

AUTHOR Farland, Ronnald; Anderson, Connie
TITLE The Transfer Center Project.
INSTITUTION California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE Sep 89
NOTE 42p.; Discussed as Agenda Item Number 2 at a meeting of the Board of Governors of California Community Colleges (Sacramento, CA, September 14-15, 1989).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Advising; Affirmative Action; *Articulation (Education); *College Transfer Students; Community Colleges; Disabilities; *Educational Counseling; Enrollment Trends; *Intercollegiate Cooperation; Minority Groups; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; State Programs; *Transfer Programs; Two Year Colleges
IDENTIFIERS *Transfer Centers

ABSTRACT

In fall 1985, California's Transfer Center Project was initiated to increase the number of community college students who transfer to four-year institutions, with particular emphasis on students from historically underrepresented groups. Transfer centers were established at 20 California community colleges. Working closely with counterparts at eight University of California (UC) campuses, 14 California State University (CSU) campuses, and 13 independent colleges, transfer center staff provide academic advising and counseling to students preparing for transfer, articulation information for specific universities and majors, information on admissions requirements, and transcript evaluations. Transfer centers also make outreach efforts to address the needs of ethnic minority students, students with disabilities, and students from other underrepresented groups. This report on the Transfer Center Project contains: (1) a project description, including information on center goals and operations; (2) findings and recommendations from an external evaluation of the project with respect to implementation and attainment of goals, cooperative efforts between the community colleges and CSU and UC systems, a 32% increase in the number of fall-term transfers to UC campuses, and an 8% increase in transfers to CSU campuses involved in the project; (3) a list of activities to be undertaken by the Office of the Chancellor of the California Community Colleges to further promote transfer; (4) lists of the Transfer Center Project colleges and advisory committee members; and (5) the executive summary of the project evaluation. (JMC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED309801

THE TRANSFER CENTER PROJECT

Ronnald Farland
Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs

Connie Anderson
Dean, Transfer Education and Articulation

California Community Colleges
Office of the Chancellor

Prepared as Agenda Item Number 2 at a meeting of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges (Sacramento, CA, Spetember 14-15, 1989).

JC 890 369

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

THE TRANSFER CENTER PROJECT 2

A Report

Background

Preparing students to transfer to four-year colleges and universities has been a primary mission of California's community colleges for many years, both by tradition and in statute. That mission was first spelled out in the 1960 *Master Plan for Higher Education*, and reaffirmed most recently in the final report of the Joint Legislative Committee for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education and in Assembly Bill 1725, the community college reform legislation.

The importance of this mission has been recognized and underscored by the Board of Governors, which has made transfer education a major priority in every *Basic Agenda*, beginning in 1985, as well as in numerous documents and policy statements it has adopted.

During the late 1970s and early 1980s, transfer rates for community college students declined, creating widespread concern among legislators, college and university officials, and civil rights leaders, who pointed to the historically low transfer rates among underrepresented students.

The Transfer Center Project was initiated in the fall of 1985 in recognition of the importance of the transfer function and in response to those concerns. It is an intersegmental pilot project designed to increase the numbers of community college students who transfer to four-year institutions, with particular emphasis on students from historically underrepresented groups.

Transfer Centers have been established at 20 community colleges, where staff and administrators work closely with their project counterparts at 8 University of California campuses, 14 California State University campuses, and 13 independent colleges and universities.

The Transfer Center staff provides academic advising and counseling to students preparing for transfer, articulation information for specific institutions and majors, and information on admission requirements, and transcript evaluation. Transfer Centers also make outreach efforts to address the transfer needs of ethnic minority

students, students with disabilities, and other students from underrepresented groups.

The Transfer Center is a central source of information on the community college campus; it maintains a library of college catalogs and other pertinent publications, hosts workshops on applications procedures in cooperation with the four-year segments; and arranges appointments for students to meet individually with college and university representatives to discuss their educational plans and goals.

Originally designed as a three-year pilot effort, the Transfer Center Project was extended for an additional year to permit completion of an independent evaluation of the implementation process and the project's effectiveness, which was completed in August of this year.

Analysis

This agenda item provides a variety of information to the Board of Governors on the Transfer Center Project, which has begun its fifth year of operation. The report that follows describes the wide range of the project's activities, and summarizes the findings and recommendations from an independent evaluation of the project, conducted by Berman, Weiler Associates.

The report concludes with a recommendation, based on the independent evaluation, that additional funds be provided to expand the Transfer Center Project to additional community college campuses and to more fully address the increasing demand for transfer efforts targeted to underrepresented students. It also outlines a series of actions to be taken by the Chancellor's Office 1989-90 to implement this recommendation.

Staff Presentation: *Ronnald Farland, Vice Chancellor*
Academic Affairs

Connie Anderson, Dean
Transfer Education and Articulation

The Transfer Center Project

Project Description

The Transfer Center Project was initiated to stimulate efforts to increase the number of community college students who transfer to four-year institutions, particularly students who have been underrepresented in transfer.

The State has allocated a total of almost $13.2 million to fund 20 Transfer Centers during the past three fiscal years – 1985-86 through 1987-88. (See Appendix A for a list of Transfer Centers.) Of this amount, the community colleges have received $3.373 million per year to house the Transfer Centers and employ campus directors and support staff, as well as to provide a support position for the project in the Chancellor's Office.

The University of California and the California State University have each received $500,000 per year to support Transfer Centers. Each UC and CSU campus in the project has designated a Transfer Center coordinator who acts a liaison with the community college to improve coordination of two- and four-year programs and who coordinates the services of visiting advisors and faculty.

For the 1988-89 fiscal year, the community colleges allocation for the Transfer Center Project was increased to $2.077 million to provide a cost-of-living adjustment and to enable the Chancellor's Office to hire permanent staff to oversee the project. A cost-of-living adjustment also has been provided for the current fiscal year, bringing the total Transfer Center allocation to $2.162 million. The University of California and State University have again received $500,000 each to support the project in 1989-90.

The Transfer Center Project is unique in several respects. Its budget provides separate funding for each segment, which is linked to shared responsibility among the segments for carrying out the program and for achieving results. The project is governed by a set of common expectations, mutually developed by the segments in 1985 and outlined in *A Plan for Implementing the Transfer Center Pilot Programs.* The project also requires operational coordination at campus and regional levels – between community colleges and universities – and at the statewide level – among the segmental systemwide offices.

InterACT, the Intersegmental Advisory Committee on Transfer, was established to advise the systemwide offices and to recommend policies and procedures for implementing and developing the Transfer Center Project. InterACT members include representatives from all three Academic Senates, as well as campus staff, including the directors of two community college Transfer Centers. (See Appendix B.)

Transfer Center Goals

At the outset of the Transfer Center Project, it was widely recognized that implementation of a single program designed to increase community college transfer rates, particularly for students underrepresented in transfer, was not likely to resolve all of the problems impacting the transfer process. At the same time, it was felt that an intersegmental approach to transfer could go a long way in helping students overcome obstacles they encounter in attempting to identify and achieve their transfer goals.

In particular, the intent of the project was to address the:

- wide dispersion and low visibility of transfer-related, student support services on community college campuses;
- difficulty encountered by many students in obtaining timely, accurate information about transfer opportunities;
- weak efforts to identify, motivate, and assist underrepresented students most in need of transfer assistance;
- incomplete, outdated, and nonexistent course-articulation agreements between community colleges and four-year institutions; and
- wide variations in the extent, quality, and depth of intersegmental cooperation on transfer issues.

In developing the state implementation plan for the Transfer Center Project, the segments established specific goals. The project was designed to increase the number of community college students, particularly underrepresented students, who:

- choose to transfer;
- complete the coursework required to transfer;
- obtain the academic and student information and services necessary for transfer; and
- actually transfer.

The amount of time and the quality of attention given by community college and university staff to helping students to transfer were also to be addressed, through increased contact and communication among staff, and between campuses, and through improved service-delivery practices.

The Transfer Center Model

The Transfer Centers, which have their own on-campus facilities, are designed to be accessible to students, faculty, and staff, and to serve as the focus of transfer information and activity for community college students. Center staff provide direct services that identify, encourage, and assist transfer students and coordinate activities with university staff. Transfer Center directors also work cooperatively with the college counseling staff to provide accurate information to students about admission requirements and the transferability of community college courses.

The community colleges assume primary responsibility for the development of campus Transfer Centers, while the role of the four-year institutions is to make regular campus visits to provide community college students with transfer information, program advice, transcript evaluations, and the availability of student services, such as housing and financial aid.

At the systemwide level, the central office of each segment has designated a program coordinator for the Transfer Center Project. The Community College Chancellor's Office is responsible for the overall coordination of the project.

In formulating the state plan, the segments clearly assumed that closer collaboration among faculty and staff at participating colleges and universities, centered around student needs, would encourage more students to transfer. This goal would be achieved by providing students with more and better information about transfer, assisting them procedurally with application forms and deadlines, and enabling them to actually transfer more readily, with fewer problems, less confusion, and greater confidence.

Evaluation of the Transfer Center Project

In consultation with InterACT, Berman, Weiler Associates undertook and independent evaluation of the Transfer Center Project. The evaluation, which was completed in August of this year, was to (1) review the degree to which community colleges and four-year institutions successfully implemented the Transfer Centers, and (2) measure the effectiveness of the project in terms of the number of students who transferred to the public four-year segments, particularly students historically underrepresented in transfer.

The evaluation also was to examine the question of whether the Transfer Center Project should be continued, and expanded to other community colleges, and if so, how the project might be improved.

Evaluation Findings

Project Implementation

Berman, Weiler found that the Transfer Center Project has clearly fulfilled its objectives in terms of the goals and expectations of the state implementation plan. Transfer Centers have been successfully implemented on all of the 20 community college campuses, and are fully operational. The general cooperation among the segments exceeds original expectations, and the project has had a positive impact on the transfer process among the participating institutions.

Those Transfer Centers that have been most successful in implementing services and activities share the following characteristics:

- They have received support from the chief campus administrators for both student services and instruction;
- They are staffed by personnel with the experience and training needed to effectively manage the Center, market its services, work with students, and integrate Center activities with other student services.
- Center staff function well with their four-year counterparts; and
- Center directors and staff target outreach and services to students from underrepresented groups.

The evaluation also found that Transfer Centers emphasizing an individualized approach to transfer services delivery were the most effective in reaching and serving students from underrepresented groups.

Other findings were that a campus-wide focus on transfer aided the implementation of a Center, and that faculty involvement in the project helped the Center meet its goals. Also, clear direction and oversight from the Community College Chancellor's Office aided in the implementation process, helping Center directors clarify program objectives and solve problems.

Berman, Weiler identified some areas that affect the functioning of the Transfer Centers as in need of further improvement:

- The four-year institutions have expressed concern about whether transfer students are receiving the amount of timely and accurate counseling needed for academic planning. With the advent of matriculation, improvements in counseling appear to be underway, but counseling issues must continue to be addressed systemwide.

- While many of the Centers encourage and assist underrepresented students to transfer by providing them with personalized services, the challenge remains to identify and motivate more such students, who frequently do not think of themselves as transfer candidates and/or who lack motivation to continue their education.

- By the end of the three-year pilot period, articulation agreements on breadth and general education requirements had been reached among all the participating institutions. However, not all articulation agreements on academic majors have been completed. Two- and four-year faculty and articulation personnel, and Transfer Center staff, must continue to work toward completion of these agreements.

As outlined in the state implementation plan, the role of the four-year institutions is to assist community college Transfer Centers in serving potential transfer students, to provide coordinated institutional support for university staff working with the Transfer Centers, and to make appropriate faculty and staff available for Transfer Center activities. The evaluation found that, overall, the four-year segments have actively supported and participated in the work of the Transfer Center, playing a significant role in their success. The University and State University have provided logistical support in the way of articulation major sheets, admissions information, transcript evaluations, and faculty availability. In addition, university representatives to the Transfer Centers have regularly engaged in program activities, including academic advising, workshops on admission requirements and procedures, applicant follow up, community college staff training, and joint faculty activities.

The evaluation noted a few isolated problems, such as insufficient visits by trained personnel to some community college Centers, and a perceived lessening of interest in the project on the part of some four-year institutions. However, these were rare problems, and most had been resolved by the time the evaluation was completed.

Intersegmental Efforts

In addition to successfully implementing the project and addressing its goals, the Transfer Centers have contributed to increased intersegmental cooperation beyond their own activities. Campus administrators and their four-year counterparts within the project have often worked together to resolve conflicts in other areas of the transfer process, such as admissions policies and procedures and course and program articulation. The evaluation found that closer working relationships have evolved between campuses geographically set apart, which would not otherwise have established a strong transfer link.

The evaluation concluded that the intersegmental approach followed in the development and implementation of the Transfer Center Project has influenced, and

has been influenced by, the concurrent increase in intersegmental cooperation throughout the state.

Project Effectiveness

Transfers to the University of California

The evaluation found that the 20 community colleges in the Transfer Center Project registered a significant increase in the number of fall-term transfers to the University of California over previous years. After taking account of certain broad trends affecting community colleges, such as financing and university admissions policies, and of specific differences among colleges affecting transfer rates, such as changes in student demographics and percentages of full-time enrollment, the Transfer Center colleges showed an increase of 32 percent in fall-term transfers to the University. Community colleges that did not participate in the project showed no significant increase in the number of transfer students during the same three-year period.

Further, Berman, Weiler estimates that the number of fall- term transfers to UC was approximately 400 higher than it might have been without the Transfer Center Project. The evaluators go on to speculate that had the project been implemented at all community colleges, as many as 1,200 additional community college students might have been prepared for transfer.

Colleges with Transfer Centers also registered a greater increase in the number of Hispanic transfer students than did non-project colleges – 22 percent versus 17 percent, respectively – as well as increases among Asian and White transfer students. The transfer rate for Black students showed little change in either group of colleges.

Transfers to the California State University

The data collected on community college transfers to the California State University revealed a slight increase for colleges in the Transfer Center Project, and virtually no change in transfer rates at non-project colleges. After taking into account the broad trends and specific differences noted earlier, the evaluators found that Transfer Centers showed an increase of approximately 8 percent in the number of full-year transfers to the State University. Non-project colleges showed an increase of approximately 3 percent.

Berman, Weiler estimates that the 20 community colleges in the project transferred over 500 more students during the three-year period than they would have without Transfer Centers. Had the project been implemented at all community colleges with

equal success, Berman, Weiler speculates that approximately 3,330 additional students would have been prepared for transfer to CSU.

Information on the ethnic composition of CSU transfers was available only for fall-term transfers. CSU data show now significant differences in transfer rates for major ethnic groups before or following the implementation of the project, either for project or non-project colleges.

Transfers to Independent Institutions

Approximately 19 percent of the community college students who transfer to four-year California institutions choose independent colleges and universities, according to a 1988 report by the California Postsecondary Education Commission, *Update of Community College Transfer Student Statistics, Fall 1987*. Because historical data on transfer to **independent** institutions are incomplete, Berman, Weiler did not attempt to assess the impact of the Transfer Center Project on this segment of higher education.

Evaluation Recommendations

Based on its findings, Berman, Weiler recommends that the Transfer Center Project not only be continued but also expanded to other community colleges:

Program Continuation and Expansion

1. Continue and expand the Transfer Center program.
2. Phase-in expansion of the program over a period of three to five years.
3. Assign high priority to underserved regions in expanding the program.
4. Maintain State-level oversight of the program.
5. Increase program funding for four-year institutions to accommodate program expansion.

The evaluators also offer a series of recommendations for improving the project:

Program Improvement

1. During the expansion process, encourage applicant colleges to incorporate key elements that have proved successful in the pilot project.

2. Intensify efforts to serve ethnic minority students from underrepresented groups.

3. Develop strategies to serve students with a low tendency to transfer.

4. Clarify expectations and accountability of the four- year institutions participating in the program.

5. Insure adequate levels of staffing for the program at four-year institutions.

6. Encourage increased regional cooperation.

Future Directions

In light of the success of the Transfer Center Project, and in response to the findings and recommendations of the evaluation by Berman, Weiler Associates, the Chancellor's Office will continue to actively promote the preparation and successful transfer of community college students, particularly those from underrepresented groups, through the Transfer Center Project, by initiating the following activities:

- Coordinate efforts to continue and expand the project with the University of California, the California State University, and the Transfer Center Project Advisory Committee;

- Coordinate efforts for program improvement with the University of California, the California State University, and the Transfer Center Project Advisory Committee;

- Pursue funding for expansion of the Transfer Center Project through an Intersegmental Budget Change Proposal for 1990-91.

- Pursue funding to strengthen transfer efforts directed to underrepresented students at existing and new Transfer Centers through an Intersegmental Budget Change Proposal for 1990-91.

- Continue to work closely with community college student services programs and with faculty to promote and support improvement in the delivery of services to transfer students, including improvements in outreach and counseling and in the development of articulation agreements for academic majors.

- Under the auspices of the Intersegmental Coordinating Council, continue to coordinate Transfer Center Project activities with other intersegmental transfer efforts in the areas of outreach, retention, faculty participation, and

articulation, such as the California Articulation Number (CAN) System, 2+2+2 Projects, Project ASSIST, MESA/MEP, and CC/CSU Joint Faculty Projects.

In addition, the expansion of the Transfer Center Project will be integral to statewide implementation of the Transfer Guarantee Program. The elements that have been identified as essential to the establishment and maintenance of the Transfer Guarantee Program are: (1) intersegmental support by chief administrative officers; (2) interaction among segmental faculty, by discipline; (3) fully developed course articulation between the segments, which serves as the basis for the transfer guarantee agreement; (4) appointment of liaisons by each segment to work with students in developing such agreements; (5) establishment of a process for students to enter into such agreements; and (6) establishing a process for monitoring student progress.

All of these elements currently exist in the Transfer Center Project and lend themselves to the implementation of the Transfer Guarantee Program. The Transfer Center Project, coupled with programs for strong interaction among segmental faculty, by discipline, and in cooperation with other transfer efforts, will provide a solid foundation upon which to implement the Transfer Guarantee Program.

APPENDIX A

TRANSFER CENTER PROJECT COLLEGES

AMERICAN RIVER COLLEGE
Sacramento

BAKERSFIELD COLLEGE
Bakersfield

CERRITOS COLLEGE
Norwalk

CITRUS COLLEGE
Glendora

COMPTON COMMUNITY COLLEGE
Compton

COSUMNES RIVER COLLEGE
Sacramento

EAST LOS ANGELES COLLEGE
Monterey Park

FRESNO CITY COLLEGE
Fresno

IMPERIAL VALLEY COLLEGE
Imperial

LANEY COLLEGE
Oakland

LOS ANGELES CITY COLLEGE
Los Angeles

MT. SAN ANTONIO COLLEGE
Walnut

PALOMAR COLLEGE
San Marcos

REDWOODS, COLLEGE OF THE
Eureka

SACRAMENTO CITY COLLEGE
Sacramento

SAN BERNARDINO VALLEY COLLEGE
San Bernardino

SAN FRANCISCO, CITY COLLEGE OF
San Francisco

SANTA BARBARA CITY COLLEGE
Santa Barbara

SANTA MONICA COLLEGE
Santa Monica

SOUTHWESTERN COLLEGE
Chula Vista

APPENDIX B

Transfer Center Project Advisory Committee

(Inter-Act 1988-89)

California Community Colleges

Connie Anderson, Dean
Transfer Education and Articulation
Chancellor's Office
California Community Colleges

Kathleen Nelson, Coordinator
Transfer Center
Chancellor's Office
California Community Colleges

Christopher Hadley, Director
Transfer Center
Laney College

Lisa Sugimoto, Director
Transfer Center
Cerritos College

University of California

Edward Apodaca, Director
Admissions and Outreach Services
Office of the President and
Universitywide Services
University of California, Berkeley

Margaret Heisel, Coordinator
Relations with Schools
Office of the President
University of California, Berkeley

Alfred Herrera, Coordinator
Community College Transfer Programs
University of California, Los Angeles

Michael Warren, Professor
English Literature
University of California, Santa Cruz

California State University

Stephanie McGraw, Dean
Academic Affairs
Education Support, Outreach
and Retention
Office of the Chancellor
The California State University

Peter Wilson, Dean of Students
California State University,
San Bernardino

Richard Kornweibel
Professor of History
California State University,
Sacramento

Vivian Franco, Assistant Coordinator
Educational Support Services
and Institutional Relations
Office of the Chancellor
California State University, Long Beach

Bob DeGuzman, Director
Transfer Center
San Francisco State University

Independent Colleges & Universities

Hans Giesecke, Director
Research and Marketing
Association of Independent California
Colleges and Universities

Sandy Cazenave, Articulation Officer
University of Southern California

APPENDIX C

AN EVALUATION OF

THE TRANSFER CENTER PILOT PROGRAM

Volume 1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

AND

RECOMMENDATIONS

R-114/1

BW ASSOCIATES

AN EVALUATION OF

THE TRANSFER CENTER PILOT PROGRAM

Volume 1

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

AND

RECOMMENDATIONS

Catherine Minicucci
(Minicucci Associates)

Paul Berman
Daniel Weiler

August 1989

R-114/2

BW ASSOCIATES

1149 Amador Avenue
Berkeley, California 94707
(415) 525-2502
(415) 843-8574

ABSTRACT

The Transfer Center program was created by agreement among the four segments of higher education, as one means among many for eliminating obstacles to transfer -- particularly for underrepresented students. This independent evaluation found that the Transfer Center Pilot Program was implemented successfully and increased transfer rates, particularly to the University of California.

This report recommends:

Program Continuation and Expansion

1. Continue the Transfer Center program at Pilot Program colleges, and provide funding to expand the program to other colleges.
2. Phase in program expansion and funding over a period of three to five years.
3. Give under-served regions of the state high priority in program expansion.
4. Maintain state oversight of the program at a level comparable to that exercised during the Pilot Program.
5. Increase funding at four-year colleges as the program expands, to insure their capacity to work with additional community colleges.

Program Improvement

6. Incorporate successful Pilot Program components into the Transfer Center model.
7. Intensify efforts to serve underrepresented ethnic minority students.
8. Require program participants to develop and implement strategies to motivate and serve students who have traditionally not been expected to transfer.
9. Clarify program expectations and accountability for four-year institutions.
10. Require four-year programs to be directed by at least a full-time coordinator plus necessary support staff, and provide state funding to support this requirement, particularly through increased funding for CSU Transfer Center programs.
11. Encourage regional mechanisms for collaboration and problem resolution.

PREFACE

This executive summary presents an overview of the findings of a three-year evaluation of the Transfer Center Pilot Program, together with recommendations pertaining to program continuation, expansion, and improvement.

The genesis of the Pilot Program was a concern among state policymakers, higher education officials and civil rights groups that community college transfer rates were too low, particularly among ethnic minority, disabled, and other students who were underrepresented among transfers to four-year institutions. Following intersegmental development of a Transfer Center plan, the program was funded by the state legislature in the Budget Act of 1985, and initiated in 1985-86 at twenty community colleges, eight UC and fourteen CSU campuses, and thirteen independent colleges and universities. The intersegmental plan called for an independent evaluation of the program to assess the effectiveness of Transfer Centers, recommend ways in which they could be improved, and recommend to the Legislature and the Governor whether Transfer Centers should continue to be funded.

A contract was awarded to BW Associates in August 1986 to evaluate the Pilot Program. The evaluation was conducted under contract to the Office of The Chancellor, California Community Colleges, and has reported to the Office of the Chancellor and to INTER-ACT, an intersegmental advisory committee.

Volume 2 of this report presents the complete evaluation findings. Volume 3 is Appendix D, which provides statistical data and information on statistical methods used for the analysis of program effectiveness.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many individuals provided direct assistance and invaluable advice to the study team conducting the evaluation. At the Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges, Dr. Judy C. Miner was responsible for administering the Pilot Program and monitoring the evaluation contract from May 1986 to August 1988, after which Dr. Connie Anderson fulfilled these duties. Both provided knowledgeable direction and advice, and much appreciated encouragement and support. Other Chancellor's Office staff who provided very useful assistance include Milt Shimabukuru, Kathleen Nelson, Bill Hamre, Buster Sano, Jerry Hudson and Chuck McIntyre.

We would also like to thank the segmental representatives on INTER-ACT, who were very supportive of our numerous requests for assistance, data and information. UC representatives Ed Apodaca and Margaret Heisel, CSU representatives Stephanie McGraw, Vivian Franco and Ralph Bigelow, and independent college representatives Joan Nay and Hans Giesecke were particularly helpful.

Campus faculty and administrators at participating community colleges, CSU and UC campuses who cooperated with the evaluation are too numerous to name. Their assistance was instrumental in making arrangements for fieldwork visits, and they were most generous in setting aside time for interviews and providing documentary materials.

Dr. Joel Brodsky, of J. Brodsky and Associates, provided invaluable technical advice on statistical methods. Ellen Liebman performed analysis programming tasks with admirable efficiency.

CONTENTS

		Page
Preface		i
Acknowledgements		iii
Section		
A.	Background	1
B.	Program Implementation	5
C.	Program Effectiveness	12
D.	Concluding Assessment	15
E.	Recommendations	16
Appendix		
	Table of Contents of Volume 2, *Findings*	

List of Tables

Table		Page
1	Transfer Center Pilot Program Colleges and Community College Grant Amounts	2
2	Transfer Center Pilot Program Grants to Four-Year Universities	3
3	Average Enrollment and Average Percent Black and Hispanic Enrollment, Pilot Program and Other Colleges, Fall 1987	4
4	Community College Transfers to UC and CSU, Fall 1984	4
5	Logistical Support for UC Transfer Centers	10

CONTENTS (Cont.)

Table		Page
6	Logistical Support for CSU Transfer Centers	11
7	Transfer to UC and CSU, 1982-83 - 1987-88	13
8	Raw Average Transfer Rates to UC (Fall), Transfers Per 1,000 Credit Enrollees	13
9	Raw Average Transfer Rates to CSU (Full Year), Transfers Per 1,000 Credit Enrollees	14

A. BACKGROUND

The Transfer Center Pilot Program was a three-year intersegmental effort designed to increase the rate at which community college students transferred to four-year colleges and universities to complete their baccalaureate degrees. The program was particularly aimed at improving the transfer rates of black, Hispanic, Native American, low-income and disabled students, who have historically been underrepresented among community college transfers to four-year institutions. The Pilot Program began in 1985-86; it was implemented by twenty community colleges, eight UC campuses, fourteen of the nineteen CSU campuses and thirteen independent colleges and universities (see Tables 1 and 2).[1]

The twenty community colleges selected to participate in the Transfer Center Pilot Program (SFTC) were widely distributed geographically (in northern, central, and southern California) and in various types of communities (urban, rural and suburban). On the average, the Transfer Center colleges were more likely to be of medium size and enroll a higher percentage of black and Hispanic students than community colleges statewide. Their share of total transfers to UC and CSU the year before the Pilot Program began was proportional to their share of total community college enrollment, with a slightly higher share of UC transfers (see Tables 3 and 4).

The independent evaluation of the program was designed to answer two questions:

(1) Was the program implemented successfully by participating community colleges and public-four year colleges and universities?

(2) Was the program effective in increasing transfer rates, particularly among underrepresented students?

The evaluation methods used to answer these questions included fieldwork at participating two- and four-year colleges, a brief telephone survey of some 200 recent transfers enrolled at three four-year campuses, analysis of statewide data on community college students and transfers to UC and CSU, and a statistical analysis of transfer activity statewide before and after Pilot Program implementation.

---

[1]The evaluation focused on transfer rates for Asian, black, Hispanic and white students transferring to UC and CSU. The number of Native American and other ethnic minority students transferring was too small to permit reliable statistical estimates of their transfer rates. The segments do not collect data on transfers of disabled students, nor are data collected by student income levels. Independent colleges and universities were not included in the study both because resource constraints made it impossible to visit those campuses, and because historical data on transfers to those institutions are incomplete.

Table 1

Transfer Center Pilot Program Colleges and
Community College Grant Amounts

COMMUNITY COLLEGES	ASSOCIATED FOUR-YEAR INSTITUTIONS	CC GRANT AMOUNT
AMERICAN RIVER	UCD CSUS, UOP	*
BAKERSFIELD	UCSB, CSU BAKERSFIELD,USC	$ 90,000
CERRITOS	UCI, CSU FULLERTON, USC	90,000
CITRUS	UCR, CAL POLY POMONA, ASUZA-PACIFIC	62,875
COMPTON	UCLA, CSU DOMINGUEZ HILLS, USC	90,000
COSUMNES RIVER	UCD, CSUS, UOP	*
EAST LOS ANGELES	UCLA, CSULA, USC	90,000
FRESNO CITY COLLEGE	UCB, UCD, UCSC, CSU FRESNO	90,000
IMPERIAL VALLEY	UCSD, SDSU, CAL POLY POMONA, ISIU	89,440
LANEY	UCB, UCD, UCSC, CSU HAYWARD, MILLS, HOLY NAMES	89,650
LOS ANGELES CITY	UCLA, CSULA, USC	86,823
MT. SAN ANTONIO	UCR, UCI, CAL POLY POMONA, UNIV. OF LAVERNE	90,000
PALOMAR	UCSD, SDSU, USIU	60,000
REDWOODS	UCS, CSU HUMBOLDT, UOP	89,646
SACRAMENTO CITY	UCS, CSUS, UOP	*
SAN BERNARDINO VALLEY	UCR, CSU SAN BERNARDINO, UNIV. OF THE REDLANDS, UCB	90,000
CITY COLLEGE OF SF	UCB, SFSU, GOLDEN STATE	90,000
SANTA BARBARA CITY	UCSB, CAL POLY/SLO, WESTMONT	90,000
SANTA MONICA CITY	UCLA, CSU NORTHRIDGE, USC, MARYMOUNT, PEPPERDINE	90,000
SOUTHWESTERN	UCSD, SDSU, NATIONAL UNIV., HOLY NAMES	89,927

*The Los Rios Community College District received an allocation of $115,698.

Table 2

Transfer Center Pilot Program
Grants to Four-Year Universities

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA	AMOUNT
Berkeley	$75,000
Davis	60,000
Irvine	50,000
Los Angeles	75,000
Riverside	50,000
San Diego	50,000
Santa Barbara	60,000
Santa Cruz	50,000

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY	AMOUNT
Bakersfield	$26,000
Fresno	26,000
Fullerton	26,000
Dominguez Hills	26,000
Hayward	26,000
Humboldt	26,000
Los Angeles	52,000
Northridge	26,000
Pomona	52,000
Sacramento	26,000
San Bernardino	26,000
San Diego	52,000
San Luis Obispo	26,000
San Francisco	26,000

Table 3

Average Enrollment and Average Percent
Black and Hispanic Enrollment
SFTC and Other Colleges*

Fall 1987

	Average Enrollment	Average Percent Black and Hispanic
SFTC Colleges	14,424	32%
Other Colleges	10,123	20%
All Colleges	10,935	22%

*Includes credit and non-credit students, for college profile purposes. Transfer rates were calculated on the basis of credit enrollment only (see Section C). Excludes enrollment from six college Centers.

Table 4

Community College Transfers to UC and CSU

Fall 1984

	UC	CSU	Total
SFTC Colleges	1,389	7,542	8,931
Percent	26%	25%	25%
Other Colleges	3,860	22,384	26,244
Percent	74%	75%	75%
All Colleges	5,249	29,926	35,075
Percent	100%	100%	100%

B. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

Participating two- and four-year colleges were responsible for implementing an April 1985 intersegmental plan for the Transfer Center Pilot Program. This plan established a framework for program implementation, and defined the roles and responsibilities of each segment. The evaluation examined the extent to which the plan was successfully implemented and the planned transfer services flowed to their intended clients, particularly underrepresented students. The success of the program depended on how well the plan was implemented by each segment.

1. Implementation at the Community Colleges

The Transfer Center Concept. The Transfer Center concept was that of a physical center on a community college campus, which would serve as the focus of transfer activities. Center staff were to provide direct services to identify, encourage, and assist potential transfer students, particularly ethnic minority, handicapped, low-income and other students who are underrepresented among transfers to four-year institutions. Centers were to strengthen curricular and services coordination and work with existing special programs such as EOPS, but were prohibited from engaging in testing, tutoring or remediation of students. Each Center was to be staffed by a certificated director who would serve as the sole contact for university representatives to the community college.

Four-year colleges and universities were to be responsible for providing direct assistance to students, as well as workshops, campus tours, and other activities. They were required to make sure that services needed by transfer students were provided by other units on their campuses and that articulation agreements were complete.

Transfer Center Clients. In 1986-87 -- midway through the Pilot Program -- the Transfer Centers reported that eight percent of students enrolled in participating community colleges were Transfer Center clients. There were relatively more minority students, full-time students and students enrolled in remedial mathematics or English among Transfer Center clients than among community college students as a whole. Our exploratory telephone survey of recent transfers from three participating community colleges indicated that 80 percent of the respondents had heard of the Transfer Center and 78 percent of those who had heard of the Center had used it. More Hispanic, white and Asian transfers than black transfers reported having heard about the Transfer Center, though black students who had heard of the Center were somewhat more likely to have used its services.

Problems and Successes. Early in the program's implementation, there were problems: the need to integrate the Centers with existing community college student services,

(counseling, EOPS and Disabled Student Services); multiple duties assumed by Transfer Center directors (which diluted their Transfer Center effort on some campuses); and a lack of training and administrative experience among some directors. However, the Transfer Centers enjoyed wide administrative support, particularly from top campus administrators, and this support was vital to the resolution of these problems. By the program's third year, most implementation issues had been resolved.

The introduction of a Transfer Center was most smoothly accomplished at colleges which had a strong tradition of transferring students to four-year institution. These colleges had receptive campus environments, where it was relatively easy to attract faculty and some segments of the student body to Transfer Center events. However, the majority of Transfer Centers experienced difficulty in obtaining active ongoing faculty involvement in the program.

Significant progress in articulation was achieved during the Pilot Program among participating colleges. By the end of the program, complete breadth and general education agreements existed among all the Transfer Center community colleges and the UC and CSU campuses they had applied with for program grants. Key transfer majors were completely articulated in all but one case. The Transfer Center program contributed to this progress in articulation by serving as a focal point for raising and resolving disputes in articulation and fostering intersegmental cooperation.

Transfer Center Services. Within each campus setting Transfer Center staff identified a pool of potential transfer students, developed a set of Transfer Center clients and provided services to those clients. These services included tracking the academic progress of potential transfer students, trying to motivate students to transfer, and assisting students in the transfer process.

Three models of Transfer Center service delivery were observed in evaluation fieldwork: a Group Approach, an Individual Approach and a Mixed Approach. Group Approach Transfer Centers served students as a group and did not keep track of their academic progress or individual use of Center services. The twelve colleges that used this approach conducted special outreach efforts to minority underrepresented students to encourage them to consider transfer and to use the Center services. The Group model was found primarily on larger community college campuses.

Individual Approach Transfer Centers, found at four colleges, served clients using a caseload approach, by carefully monitoring individual student academic progress and utilization of Center services. The Individual Model was used primarily by small colleges (fewer than 5,000 students) with high percentages of minority enrollments (40 percent or more).

The Mixed Approach served Asian and white students using the Group Approach and served black and Hispanic students using the Individual Approach. The Mixed model

was found at four campuses with over 10,000 students and between 15 to 20 percent minority enrollment.

Both the Individual and Mixed models of Transfer Center service delivery provided individualized assistance to minority underrepresented students. This appeared to be more successful than the Group model for reaching these students and providing them with services.

Summary. The Transfer Center program evolved on most of the community college campuses over the course of the Pilot Program. Though there were problems in the early stages of the program, progress was made in clarifying the roles and responsibilities of Transfer Center directors and integrating the Centers with other student services, and all Centers became fully operational and met state plan goals within the Pilot Program period. Successfully implemented Centers received top level administrative support, were led by personnel with appropriate experience and training, functioned effectively with their four-year counterparts, and were operated by staff who worked hard at outreach to underrepresented students.

Specifically, the evaluation found:

1. All Transfer Centers became fully operational and met state plan goals.
2. Supportive administrative environments aided effective Transfer Center implementation.
    - 2.1 Transfer Centers did not operate efficiently until they had been fully integrated into campus student services units.
    - 2.2. Multiple duties diluted Transfer Center directors' focus on transfer.
    - 2.3. Successful Transfer Center implementation required top level campus administrative support.
    - 2.4. Direct reporting relationships to senior administrators facilitated successful implementation.
    - 2.5. Lack of training and administrative inexperience slowed the efforts of many Transfer Center directors to develop efficient Center operations.
3. Where administrative environments were supportive, Individual and Mixed approaches were most successful in identifying and serving minority underrepresented students.
4. A campus-wide focus on transfer aided Transfer Center implementation.

5. Faculty involvement in the program helped Transfer Centers to meet their goals.

6. The Transfer Centers contributed to progress in articulation among participating colleges.

7. Clear state direction and oversight helped Transfer Center directors understand program objectives and solve problems.

8. Most Transfer Centers learned and changed over the course of the Pilot Program.

9. Some Transfer Center issues were not fully resolved at the conclusion of the Pilot Program.

   9.1. Counseling improvements were still needed.

   9.2. More work was needed to reach less-motivated students.

   9.3. Articulation of majors was not complete.

2. Implementation at Four-Year Institutions

Goals. The goal shared by most community college administrators -- increasing all transfers with an emphasis on minority underrepresented students -- was also the goal of four-year college administrators at ten of the eighteen four-year colleges visited during evaluation fieldwork. Staff at eight four-year colleges expressed a narrower goal of increasing solely black and Hispanic transfers. These staff had a greater sense of urgency toward outreach to minority students than that expressed by their community college counterparts, which led to greater collaborative efforts to locate and motivate minority student transfer candidates.

Activities and Services. Four-year college Transfer Center programs engaged in a wide range of activities and services: application workshops for community college students conducted at community college Transfer Centers; individual academic advisement for community college students; applicant follow-up for students applying to four-year campuses; training for community college staff on current four-year college admissions policies; and articulation agreements and faculty activities in which four-year college faculty met with community college faculty in related disciplines. All the participating four-year colleges visited during the evaluation implemented the workshops and academic

advising components of the program, but other program elements were implemented less consistently.

Campus Support for Transfer Center Services. In order to provide the services discussed above, four-year Transfer Center staff needed logistical support from their institutions. They needed articulation major sheets, which explain four-year entrance requirements and prerequisites for majors; admissions data on the status of community college transfer applicants; access to admissions evaluators to assess transfer applicant transcripts; and access to four-year faculty to arrange articulation and other meetings with community college instructors. In all but a few cases, complete logistical support from the four-year institution was present by the end of the Pilot Program (see Tables 5 and 6).[1]

In summary:

1. All participating four-year colleges visited during the evaluation implemented the workshops and academic advising components of the program; other program elements were implemented less consistently.
2. Differences among four-year campuses in the degree of emphasis placed on outreach to black and Hispanic students were associated with differences in the way four-year administrators perceived Transfer Center program goals.
3. Logistical support from four-year institutions was necessary for effective implementation of Transfer Center activities.
4. There were isolated problems in the implementation of the four-year college Transfer Center Program.

3. Intersegmental Cooperation

Intersegmental cooperation among community college and four-year college staff was an essential feature of the state plan for the Transfer Center Pilot Program. The level of cooperation found by the evaluation met and exceeded state expectations, and extended beyond the activities of the Transfer Center program itself. Collaborative outreach to minority students, regional cooperative efforts, and improved relationships between two- and four-year administrators helped to resolve problems related to admissions policies and procedures, articulation, and other matters of importance to the transfer function. Regional clusters of participating institutions emerged, extending beyond the boundaries of the original sets of colleges that applied for program support.

---

[1]BW has been informed by CSU segment-level staff that since the evaluation was completed full logistical support has been implemented at all participating CSU campuses.

Table 5

Logistical Support for
UC Transfer Centers

Support	Number of Campuses			
	1986-87		1987-88	
	Present	Absent	Present	Absent
Articulation Major Sheets	3	1	7	0
Access to Admissions Data	3	1	7	0
Access to Admissions Evaluator	1	3	7	0
Faculty Availability	2	2	3	4

Table 6

Logistical Support for
CSU Transfer Centers

	Number of Campuses			
	1986-87		1987-88	
Support	Present	Absent	Present	Absent
Articulation Major Sheets	5	2	9	2
Access to Admissions Data	4	3	10	1
Access to Admissions Evaluator	5	2	9	2
Faculty Availability	6	1	10	1

C. PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS

The evaluation collected data on the number of transfers in fall and spring to UC and CSU campuses (see Table 7). In order to assess program effectiveness, the evaluation calculated transfer rates and compared them for state funded Transfer Center (SFTC) and other community colleges before and after the introduction of the Pilot Program. The "pre-program" transfer rate was defined as the number of transfers in 1982, 1983 and 1984 divided by the community college credit enrollment in those years. The "post-program" transfer rate was defined as the number of transfers in 1987 (when the Pilot Program was most fully implemented) divided by the average credit enrollment in 1985, 1986, and 1987.

1. Transfers to UC

SFTC colleges showed growth in their average fall transfer rate to UC, while other colleges showed a slight decline (see Table 8). However, the SFTC colleges had a higher percentage of full-time credit students and a lower percentage of white students than did other colleges. Analysis showed that these differences affect transfer rates. Therefore, the raw average transfer rates for SFTC and other colleges were adjusted statistically, with the result that the SFTC colleges' UC adjusted transfer rates increased following program implementation, while the UC transfer rates for other colleges remained constant. We conclude that the Pilot Program colleges showed a significant increase in UC fall transfer rates, even after taking into account broad trends affecting all community colleges and specific differences among colleges that affect transfer rates.

Specifically:

- State funded Transfer Center colleges are estimated to have increased their fall UC transfer rate by approximately 30 percent, while other colleges showed no average increase.
- The number of fall UC transfers from SFTC colleges is estimated to be approximately 400 more than it might have been without the program.
- If the program had been implemented statewide, there might have been an estimated 1,200 additional community college fall transfers to UC -- an increase of approximately 25 percent.

Table 7

Transfers to UC and CSU

1982-83 - 1987-88

	UC*		CSU**	
	SFTC Colleges	Other CCs	SFTC Colleges	Other CCs
1982-83	1306	3824	11,895	33,299
1983-84	1308	3910	11,843	33,891
1984-85	1401	3855	11,712	33,698
1985-86	1395	3534	11,839	33,528
1986-87	1270	3588	11,184	32,432
1987-88	1617	3847	11,697	33,003

*Fall only. Data on winter/spring transfers to UC are not available for years prior to 1986-87, and were not used in transfer rate calculations. Source: CPEC, Update of Community College Transfer Student Statistics, Fall 1987, Report 88-15 (Sacramento: March 1988).

**Full school year transfers. Source: CPEC, *Ibid.*, and Update of Community College Transfer Student Statistics, 1988-89, Report 89-23 (Sacramento: August 1989), corrected by data provided by CSU.

Table 8

Raw Average Transfer Rates to UC (Fall)

Transfers Per 1,000 Credit Enrollees

	Pre-Implementation Period	Post-Implementation Period
SFTC Colleges	4.8	5.9
Other Colleges	4.2	4.0

13

Though the data are not conclusive, they indicate that transfer rates to UC increased for Asian and Hispanic students from Pilot Program colleges. Specifically:

- The data suggest that the Pilot Program had its greatest effect at UC on Asians, followed by Hispanics. There may have been a slight gain for white students, whereas the data do not reveal any improvement in the black transfer rate.
- At colleges that were not in the Pilot Program, Asian and white transfer rates to UC appeared to decline, which strengthens our confidence in the conclusion that the Pilot Program colleges did relatively better for these ethnic groups. For black students, the transfer rate showed little change for either SFTC or other colleges.

2. Transfers to CSU

The statistical evidence suggests a slight increase in the rate of transfers of students from SFTC colleges to CSU after implementation of the Pilot Program. Over the same time period, the transfer rate for non-SFTC colleges showed virtually no change, as Table 9 indicates.

Table 9

Raw Average Transfer Rates to CSU (Full Year)

Transfers Per 1,000 Credit Enrollees

	Pre-Implementation Period	Post-Implementation Period
SFTC Colleges	42.0	44.0
Other Colleges	38.8	37.8

Given the large number of students at CSU campuses, this slight increase in transfer rate translates into large numbers:

- The number of full year CSU transfers from SFTC colleges is estimated to be approximately 500 more than it might have been without the program.

- If the program had been implemented statewide, there might have been an estimated 3,300 additional community college full year transfers to CSU -- an increase of approximately seven percent.

The data reveal no significant difference between pre- and post-implementation transfer rates for different major ethnic groups, for either SFTC or other colleges.[3] While there may be some small differences, the data are too statistically uncertain to support further conclusions.

D. CONCLUDING ASSESSMENT

The accomplishments of the Transfer Center Pilot Program need to be assessed against the goals and expectations of the April 1985 intersegmental plan. In terms of this plan, the Pilot Program has clearly fulfilled its objectives -- the Transfer Centers are fully operational and there is general cooperation among the segments that exceeds original expectations. The Transfer Centers have learned much since their inception and should continue to learn how to improve. On some community college campuses, Transfer Centers appeared to be contributing to broader institutional changes, such as a stronger campus-wide focus on transfer. It is too early to assess these potentially important secondary effects of the Pilot Program.

Insofar as their effectiveness can be assessed, the data indicate that SFTC colleges had a significant increase in their overall fall transfer rate to UC, and a slight increase in their overall full year transfer rate to CSU. Over the same period, the overall transfer rates to both UC and CSU from non-SFTC colleges remained virtually unchanged. Fall transfer rates for Asian, white and Hispanic students increased at UC for SFTC colleges. Quantitative and fieldwork evidence reveal that the Transfer Centers focused heavily on full-time students who were interested in transferring to four-year institutions.

From the standpoint of statistical analysis, the quantitative evidence does not allow us to draw cause and effect conclusions about the Pilot Program. The data cannot tell us

---

[3]The ethnic composition of transfers to CSU was not available for summer, winter or spring transfers; the transfer rate for different ethnic groups was calculated on the basis of fall transfers only.

conclusively whether increases in transfer rates were caused by the Transfer Centers per se or were more attributable to other activities and decisions of the participating two-and four-year institutions -- or to other factors altogether. However, the fieldwork revealed that the intentions of these institutions were usually focused or executed through the Transfer Centers and the mechanisms of cooperation that were established for the Pilot Program. These findings, when considered with the quantitative evidence on program impact, indicate that the Transfer Centers played a vital role in the broader picture of improving transfers.

E. RECOMMENDATIONS

The evaluation was charged by the Office of the Chancellor and INTER-ACT with recommending to the Legislature and the Governor whether Transfer Centers should continue to be funded, and recommending to the segments how the Centers could be improved. The following recommendations are responsive to these directives. Part 1 of the recommendations addresses the issue of program continuation and expansion; Part 2 provides advice on program improvement.

1. Program Continuation and Expansion

Recommendation 1: **Continue and expand the Transfer Center program.**

> **The state should continue to fund Transfer Centers at the two- and four-year colleges that participated in the Pilot Program. The Transfer Center program should also be expanded to other colleges, and state funding should be provided to support that expansion.**

With the Transfer Center program, the state had hoped to create one means among many for eliminating obstacles to transfer, particularly for underrepresented students. The preponderance of evaluation evidence indicates that this effort has succeeded, and should therefore continue to be funded at the Pilot Program colleges. Expansion of the Transfer Center program holds the promise of extending this success to other colleges throughout the state.

Recommendation 2: **Phase in program expansion.**

> **The state should phase in new Transfer Center sites, and funding for these sites, over a period of three to five years.**

A phased-in expansion should bring a new group of 15-30 community colleges into the Transfer Center program each year for three to five years. The evaluation revealed that the Pilot Program suffered at first from a number of implementation problems, some of which were not fully resolved until the third year of the program. This is common for new programs, and while some problems may be avoidable in light of Pilot Program experience, it is prudent to assume that new Transfer Centers will have implementation difficulties -- and adaptations -- of their own. Thus, as each new group of colleges joins the program, new ideas and new implementation lessons would become available to succeeding groups. The 3-5 year phase-in period would give state and local program managers the time they need to absorb and apply this growing fund of ideas and experience, so that the program can be continuously strengthened as it grows.

Recommendation 3: **Give under-served regions high priority in program expansion.**

> **The first phase of Transfer Center expansion should concentrate on funding new Transfer Centers in regions that were not well represented in the Pilot Program.**

The evaluation confirmed that transfer is essentially a regional phenomenon, in that most transfer students enroll at four-year institutions in the vicinity of their community college. Because there were too few colleges in the Pilot Program to cover all regions of the state, some regions (e.g., parts of the Bay Area) have no state funded Transfer Centers; other regions with many community colleges had only one or two colleges in the Pilot Program. To insure the equitable distribution of the program statewide, these under-served regions should have high priority for the first phase of program expansion. This criterion for expansion, however, should not take precedence over criteria designed to insure high quality programs.

Recommendation 4: **Maintain state oversight of the program.**

> **As the Transfer Center program expands, the CCC Chancellor's Office, the systemwide offices of UC and CSU, and INTER-ACT should maintain a level of program oversight comparable to that exercised during the Pilot Program.**

As noted above in the discussion of *Recommendation 2,* the CCC Chancellor's Office four-year systemwide staff and INTER-ACT provided program oversight that helped

to resolve a number of implementation problems. The CCC Chancellor's Office staff in particular maintained a high level of contact with the community college campuses, provided feedback on issues identified in the course of these visits, and worked with Transfer Center and other college staff to develop strategies for improvement. The Chancellor's Office also facilitated information sharing among Transfer Center staff around the state, which was highly valued by both two- and four-year participants. This level of oversight should be maintained as the program expands, so that new participants have access to the same amount of state direction and assistance as did the Pilot Program colleges. If necessary, additional segment level staff should be assigned to the program for this purpose.

Recommendation 5: **Increase funding at four-year colleges to accommodate expansion.**

> **As new community college Transfer Centers are funded, Transfer Center programs at associated four-year institutions should be given additional funding where necessary, to insure their capacity to work with additional community college campuses.**

The evaluation found that successful implementation of a Transfer Center program reflected high levels of effort at both two- and four-year colleges. As new community college Transfer Centers are funded, they will in most cases be associated with four-year institutions that are already working with Pilot Program Centers; over the course of program expansion, some four-year campuses may be asked to work with many additional state funded Transfer Centers. As the program expands, the state should, where necessary, provide additional funds to four-year campus programs in proportion to the expansion, so they can maintain their current levels of effort (see also *Recommendation 10*).

2. Program Improvement

Recommendation 6: **Incorporate successful components into the Transfer Center model.**

> **In developing criteria for new Transfer Center grant awards, the state should encourage applicants to include key components that have proved successful in the Pilot Program.**

The evaluation identified a number of program components that contributed to successful Transfer Centers. At community colleges, these components included:

- Emphasizing individualized approaches to service delivery;
- Hiring full-time certificated staff members with appropriate experience and training as Center directors;
- Relieving directors of duties away from the Center;
- Arranging for Center directors to report directly to senior administrators;
- Having senior administrators assume responsibility for insuring the integration of Transfer Centers with other student services.

At four-year institutions, successful programs provided essential logistical support to Transfer Center coordinators, and engaged in a wide range of activities identified by the evaluation. In specifying criteria for program expansion grants, the state should encourage applicants to develop their Transfer Center proposals with these findings in mind, though they should be free to adapt these program features to meet their own needs.

Recommendation 7: **Intensify efforts to serve underrepresented ethnic minority students.**

Revised program guidelines should require community and four-year colleges to identify and implement specific strategies for reaching underrepresented ethnic minority students, motivating them to consider transfer, and providing them with needed services.

The evaluation showed that more work is needed to help underrepresented ethnic minority students. The state should require two- and four-year applicants for new or renewed program funding to identify strategies for working with underrepresented ethnic minority students, and make firm commitments to implementing these strategies. The state should also disseminate information on promising approaches employed during the Pilot Program, including individual and mixed approach service models and models of cooperative intersegmental outreach.

Recommendation 8: **Develop strategies to serve students with low tendency to transfer.**

Revised program guidelines should require community and four-year colleges to collaborate on devising and implementing strategies to identify, motivate and serve students who have traditionally not been expected to transfer.

The evaluation showed that Transfer Centers were most successful in serving full-time students who were interested in continuing their college educations. In order to serve other types of students, greater efforts will be needed to identify and motivate

students who have historically been much less likely to transfer. To this end, the state should require two- and four-year applicants for new or renewed program funding to identify how they will develop cooperative intra-institutional and intersegmental strategies for serving potentially qualified students with low motivation or aspirations, part-time and evening students, and other students with low propensities to transfer. (Some, but not all, ethnic minority underrepresented students are in this category.) Applicants should be encouraged to propose strategies they feel will have high payoff, and to provide appropriate rationales in support of their proposals. The state should sponsor regional and state conferences focusing on this issue, to include representatives from the segments, community and civil rights groups, and secondary school educators.

Recommendation 9: **Clarify expectations and accountability for four-year institutions.**

> **The intersegmental Transfer Center plan should be modified to include a more specific set of expectations for four-year campus Transfer Center programs. Program goals, components, staffing, and logistical support should be specified.**

The April 1985 intersegmental plan for Transfer Centers contains little direction for four-year college Transfer Center programs. These programs consistently implemented two components (academic advising and workshops) and less consistently implemented three components (applicant follow up, training community college staff and faculty activities). As the Pilot Program evolved, the logistical support needed from four-year campuses became more widely available to their Transfer Center coordinators, and other improvements were implemented, but four-year campus administrator goals for the program remained more diverse -- and less consistent with state plan goals -- than those of community college administrators. To strengthen the program at four-year colleges as it expands to more community colleges (and to additional CSU campuses) the state should take advantage of what has been learned during the Pilot Program to clarify expectations and accountability for four-year Transfer Center programs. The state plan should more specifically define program goals, as well as desirable program components, staffing, and logistical support.

Recommendation 10: **Insure adequate staffing levels at four-year institutions.**

> **The state plan should specify that a full-time coordinator plus necessary support staff is the minimum level of effort required for four-year campus Transfer Center program staffing. State program funding should support this requirement.**

Transfer Center programs require a high level of effort from each participating four-year campus. The evaluation found that the most successful staffing pattern at four-

ERIC Clearinghouse for Junior Colleges SEP 15 1989